Remarks

Claims 1, 4-9 and 12-14 stand rejected following the Office Action of November 25, 2008. Claims 4-6 and 9 have been amended. New claims 15-16 have been added.

The specification has been amended to correct minor inadvertent errors. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Claim Rejections

A.   35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the respective limitations in these claims are indefinite.

Claim 4 and claim 6 have been amended to clarify the respective claimed features. As such, no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that the amended claims 4 and 6 are now patentable under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

B.   35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-9 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 7,177,637, issued to Liu et al. (hereinafter, "Liu"), in view of U.S. Patent 6,950,628, issued to Meier et al. (hereinafter, "Meier").

Claim 14 stands rejected as being obvious over Liu, Meier and further in view of U.S. published application 2002/0157090A1 of Anton, Jr. (hereinafter, "Anton").

The Examiner acknowledged (on page 4, Office Action) that Liu does not teach the features of determining at the wireless access point whether the access request was received from local user or guest, the determining including examining a user domain received from a party seeking access to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain.

Thus, the Examiner cited Meier's col. 2, lines 2-8 and col. 4, lines 13-22 as teaching the above features, further stating that Meier's SSID (Service Set Identifier) reads on the user domain of Applicants' claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully disagree because Meier's SSID is fundamentally different from a user domain, and there is no suggestion in Meir of using a user domain for distinguishing between a local user or a guest, as taught in Applicants' invention.

Instead, Meier teaches that a wireless station desiring to associate with an access point would send a message to the access point, with the message containing an SSID, which is an arbitrary "name" for a service set (col. 2, lines 2-6), and "[a] Service Set is an arbitrary grouping of one or more network service parameters" (col. 4, lines 17-18). Furthermore, Meier teaches that one or more service sets may be created at the access point, with each service set having a unique SSID (col. 2, lines 9-11). Thus, it is clear that Meier's SSID, which represents a service set created at an access point based on an arbitrary grouping of network service parameters, is quite different from a user domain.

Even though Meier teaches that service parameters may be used to differentiate network access, and that certain wireless stations may be grouped into a "GUEST" Service Set (col. 4, lines 18-22), there is no teaching that the access point examines a <u>user domain</u> for determining between a local user or a guest, as provided in Applicants' claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not obvious over the combined teaching of Liu and Meier, and thus, patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Independent claim 9 also recites features similar to that of claim 1, including "said access point determining whether the access request was received from a local user or a guest by examining if a user domain received with the access request indicates a guest domain." For the same reason set forth above, claim 9 is also patentable over the teaching of Liu and Meier.

Since claims 4-8 depend from claim 1, and claims 12-13 depend from claim 9, these dependent claims are also patentable over Liu and Meier for the same reason set forth above.

In rejecting claim 14, the Examiner further cited Anton for teaching a firewall. Since claim 14 depends from claim 9, and there is no showing in the Office Action that Anton teaches the features discussed above as missing in Liu and Meier, Applicants submit that claim 14 is also patentable over the combined teaching of Liu, Meier and Anton.

New Claims 15-16

New claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 6 and claim 13, respectively. Claim 15 recites a feature of "providing web browser based authentication if the request for access was not received in the IEEE 802.1x format," and claim 16 recites a similar feature. Support for the

subject matter of these claims can be found, for example, on p.3, line 30 - p.4, line 1; and p.5, lines 10-20, of the original specification. No new matter has been added.

It is believed that neither Liu, Meier nor Anton teaches or suggests the step of "providing web browser based authentication if the request for access was not received in the IEEE 802.1x format." Thus, both claims 15-16 are patentable over Liu, Meier and Anton for this additional reason.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the accompanying remarks, Applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If, however, the Examiner believes such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6834, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
Junbiao Zhang et al.

February 25, 2009
Date

/Wan Yee Cheung/
Wan Yee Cheung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,410
Phone: 609-734-6834

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312